



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,604	03/01/2002	Steve Bakke	021241.000006	1958
4095	7590	03/03/2006		
VINSON & ELKINS. L.L.P. 1001 FANNIN STREET 2300 FIRST CITY TOWER HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760			EXAMINER SHIFERAW, ELENI A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/086,604	BAKKE, STEVE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eleni A. Shiferaw	2136	

**All Participants:**

(1) Eleni A. Shiferaw.

(2) Steven T. McDonald.

**Status of Application:** Pre-appeal conference request

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 February 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*prior art applied and claims 1-26*

**Claims discussed:**

*14, 1, 8, 2, and 26 and/or claims 1-26*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*US 2004/0210674 A1 and 6822957 B1*


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Steven T. McDonald on February 28, 2006 and discussed independent claim 14. Steven T. McDonald is willing to amend the functionality of "voice firewall" on claim 14, because the office has interpreted the "voice firewall" as a router and/or gateway of the internet telephony of Schuster reference that modifies/changes the internal network address 10.0.0.X of network 12 to external common address/public address 198.10.20.30 which is the same functionality of the applicants disclosure of "voice firewall" on page 15 paragraph 0041, however Steven T. McDonald would like to contact the applicant on how to amend the "voice firewall" to overcome the router/gateway of internet telephony of Schuster reference. Regarding other independent claims 1, 8, 20, and 26, "soft switch element 65" of figure 3, according to the disclosure, is a device that creates a connect command and transmits the command to voice firewall input port (paragraph 0039-0040 of applicant's disclosure). The router/provider location 26 receives a connection signal, from telephony proxy server/soft switch 24 of Schuster et al. figure 1, that has private address i.e. 10.0.0.X (Schuster et al. col. 5 lines 16-col. 6 lines 65, col. 10 lines 30-40, and col. 23 lines 17-48). Steven T. McDonald agreed to provide the suggested "voice firewall" functionality to overcome the references applied for independent claims 1, 8, 20, and 26 as well.